

University of Groningen

Eden and the Temple

Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. van

Published in:

Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1999

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. V. (1999). Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2. In Luttikhuisen/Gerard P. (Ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (pp. 63 - 95). Martinus Nijhoff/Brill.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

EDEN AND THE TEMPLE: THE REWRITING OF GENESIS 2:4–3:24 IN *THE BOOK OF JUBILEES*

J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN

Introduction

As far as the final text is concerned, the narrative of Genesis 2 and 3 can be divided into two parts.¹ The first part (Gen 2:4b–25) is the creation story. It describes the creation of man, the garden, and the helpers of man (first the animals and then the woman). In this part the man acquires access to the Garden is prohibited from eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The second part of the story (Gen 3:1–24) describes the rejection from the Garden of Eden. The serpent tempts the woman to eat the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The woman seems to believe the words of the serpent, and eats the fruit. She then gives it to her husband, who also eats it. Thereafter, both man and woman become ashamed and make themselves aprons and hide from God, who accuses them and gives a judgement to the serpent, the woman, and the man. Finally, God dismisses the man from the Garden in order to prevent him from eating from the tree of life as well.

Although both parts of the story of the Garden of Eden are closely interwoven and can, to a certain extent, be read as one narrative, both the modern as well as the ancient reader have encountered some problems with the story. First, there is a duplication of the events included in another creation story in the bible: Genesis 1. Between the first and second creation narrative, however, there are many differences and even contradictory statements, which pose problems to the reader. Second, within the story of the Garden of Eden itself, there are also some elements that differ or even contradict one another. Modern readers, or at least modern exegetes, have tried to resolve the discrepancies by constructing different layers in the texts,

¹ For the structure of Gen 2:4–3:24, see G.W. Coats, *Genesis with an Introduction to Narrative Literature* (FOTL, 1), Grand Rapids, MI 1983, 49–60; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1.1* (BKAT I/1), Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1976², 259–269.

or by describing several traditions working within the text. Many of the ancient readers encountered the same sorts of problems with the biblical text. The way they try to harmonise the differences is, however, somewhat different from the harmonising method of modern exegetes.

In this article I discuss the story of the Garden of Eden in the Book of Jubilees, which was written in the middle of the second century BCE. It is presented as a revelation that Moses received at Mount Sinai, but it actually consists of a rewriting and interpretation of the biblical narrative from Genesis 1 to Exodus 16. Chapter 3 of the book concerns the story of the Garden of Eden, and in this article I will deal with this chapter. Firstly, I will give a short overview of the structure of Jubilees 3 in comparison with the story in Gen 2:4–3:24; secondly, I will look more closely at some of the differences between both texts.

1. *The structure of Jubilees 3 in comparison with Genesis 2:4–3:24*

The narrative of Jubilees 3, which runs parallel with Gen 2:4–3:24, can be divided into two parts. The first part (3:1–16) runs parallel with Genesis 2, which concerns the second account of the creation. The author of Jubilees, however, does not include a second account of creation. The events of Genesis 2 are the chronological continuation of the creation, which took place during the first week. The first part of Jubilees 3 can be characterised as a description of the first seven years of creation. The second part (3:17–35) runs parallel with the second part of the narrative of Genesis 2–3, which concerns the rejection from the Garden (Gen 3:1–24). The precise dating of the arrival of the serpent in 3:17 (“in the second month, on the seventeenth”) and the departure of Adam and his wife from the Garden in 3:32 (“At the beginning of the fourth month”) underlines the importance of chronology to the author of Jubilees. I have, therefore, named the second part of the story “The Last Forty-Five Days in the Garden.” In the following table I give an overview of the general comparison of Gen 2:4–3:24 and Jub. 3:1–35.²

² In the table I put in “normal script” the corresponding elements between Gen 2:4–3:24 and *Jub.* 3:1–35 and in small caps the elements of Gen 2:4–3:24 which do not occur in *Jub.* 3:1–35, and vice versa. I underline those elements that show rearrangement; finally, I put in *italics* differences between Gen 2:4–4:1a and *Jub.* 3:1–35, other than addition and omission.

Part A. The creation story (Gen 2:4b-25)		Part A. The events in the first seven years of creation (<i>Jub.</i> 3:1-16)	
1. 2:4b-6	TIME BEFORE THE CREATION OF MAN		
2. 2:7-15	CREATION OF MAN AND GARDEN		
	a. 2:7 CREATION OF MAN		
	b. 2:8 CREATION OF GARDEN		
	c. 2:9-15: DESCRIPTION OF THE GARDEN (THE TREES [9], THE RIVERS [10-14], THE PLACING OF MAN [15])		
3. 2:16-17	PROHIBITION AGAINST EATING OF THE TREE OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL		
4. 2:18-24	Creation of helper	1. 3:1-7	The events in the second week of creation
	a. 2:18 <u>plan</u>		a. 3:1-2 <i>presentation of the animals to Adam, naming</i>
	b. 2:19-20 CREATION OF THE ANIMALS, <i>presentation to the man and naming</i>		b. 3:3 EXPERIENCE OF HIS LONELINESS
	c. 2:21-24 <i>building of the woman</i>		c. 3:4 <u>plan</u>
			d. 3:5-7 <i>building of the woman</i>
		2. 3:8-14	POSTPONEMENT OF THE ENTRANCE INTO THE GARDEN AND <i>HALAKAH</i> WITH REGARD TO A WOMAN WHO IS GIVING BIRTH
5. 2:25	<i>Time together in the garden before the temptation</i>	3. 3:15-16	<i>Time together in the garden before the temptation</i>

Part B. Rejection from the Garden (Gen 3:1–24)		Part B. The Last Forty-Five Days in the Garden (<i>Jub.</i> 3:17–35)	
1. 3:1–7	<i>Temptation and transgression</i>	1. 3:17–22	<i>Temptation and transgression</i>
2. 3:8–13	HIDING FROM God AND ACCUSATION		
3. 3:14–29	Judgement a. 3:14–15 <i>serpent</i> b. 3:16 <i>woman</i> c. 3:17–19 <i>man</i>	2. 3:23–25	Judgement a. 3:23ab <i>serpent</i> b. 3:23c–24 <i>woman</i> c. 3:25 <i>man</i>
4. 3:20–24	Conclusion a. 3:20 <u>new name</u> <u>given to Eve</u> b. 3:21 <i>second clothing</i> c. 3:22–24 <i>dismissal</i>	3. 3:26	Conclusion a. 3:26ab <i>second clothing</i> b. 3:26c <i>dismissal</i>
		4. 3:27–31	FINAL STATEMENTS a. 3:27 ADAM ACTING AS A PRIEST b. 3:28–29 ANIMALS STOP SPEAKING AND ARE DISMISSED FROM GARDEN c. 3:30–31 <i>HALAKAH</i> CONCERNING THE COVERING OF NAKEDNESS
		5. 3:32–35	DEPARTURE FROM THE GARDEN AND SETTLEMENT IN ELDA (among others <u>new name</u> <u>given to Eve</u>)

One of the most striking modifications to the story of Genesis 2–3 in the Book of Jubilees are the lengthy *omissions*. I point to the omission of Gen 2:4–17, which describes the creation of man and the Garden, and the prohibition against eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; and to the omission of Gen 3:8–13, which describes the hiding of Adam from God after the transgression and the accusation. In addition to the omissions, there are also lengthy *additions* with regard to the text of Genesis. I point to the addition of *Jub.* 3:8–14, which stresses the postponement of the entrance of Adam and his wife into the Garden of Eden and relates this postponement to the *halakah* concerning the woman who is giv-

ing birth. There is also an *addition* to the end of the second part of the story. It is concerned with some final statements: Adam acting as a priest, the animals that are dismissed from the garden, and the *halakah* concerning the covering of nakedness. The differences between Genesis and Jubilees, however, are not only expressed in the omissions and additions, but also in passages that run parallel to each other. As can be seen in the synoptic overview of both passages in the appendix, there are extensive modifications.

2. *Some Differences between Jubilees 3 and Genesis 2–3*

A discussion of all the differences between Jubilees and Genesis is beyond the scope of this paper; therefore, only the most obvious differences will be covered. They mainly show the tendency to *harmonise*. The author of Jubilees first harmonises the two accounts of the creation; second, the contradictions within the story of the Garden of Eden itself; and third, the contradictions between the account in Genesis and other creation narratives related to the story in Genesis. The differences between both texts also show elements of interpretation, which I cannot attribute to the harmonising tendency.

2.1. *Harmonising the two accounts of creation*

The author of Jubilees harmonises both accounts of creation by applying the strategies of omission and rearrangement.

In the first place, there are some *contradictions* between Genesis 1 and 2. I point to Gen 2:5 (“when no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up . . . there was no man to work the ground”). However, the plants and herbs had already been created at the third day of creation, whereas the man was created on the sixth day. Therefore, the text of Gen 2:5 is *omitted*.

In the second place, there is also some *duplication* of some elements included in the first account of creation in the second account. Genesis 2:9 describes the creation of the trees. They had already been created on the third day. Therefore the text of Gen 2:9 is omitted. Genesis 2:19 describes the creation of the animals; they had, however, already been created on the fifth and sixth days. Therefore, the author of Jubilees omits an account of their second creation. In *Jub.* 3:1–4, which is the rewriting of Gen 2:18–20, they

are only brought to Adam in the second week of creation. Also, the creation of man in Gen 2:7 is a duplication of the creation in Genesis 1. There is also a contradiction related to the creation of man. In Genesis 1 man and woman are created at the same time; in Genesis 2, the man is created first, then the animals, and, finally, the woman. In Jubilees man is created in the first week of creation; he is not created again in the second. The woman is present within Adam, undeveloped, as one of his bones. Thus, the woman had already been created in the first week. However, in the second week she is actually taken out of man, she is completed, and she is presented to him. The formation of the woman in the second week is mainly a completion and a presentation of her to Adam.³

The author of Jubilees does not only harmonise the contradictions by omitting certain elements of the story of Genesis, but he also *rearranges* the text. I point to the description of the creation of the Garden of Eden on the third day in Jubilees (*Jub.* 2:5–7). The author has brought over several elements from Genesis 2. There may have been several reasons for the author to do so.⁴ In the first place, the writer of Jubilees may have seen a link between the trees in Gen 1:11–12 (“...fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed...”), and the trees in Gen 2:9. According to Gen 2:16–17, all the trees in the Garden were fruit trees.

In the second place, the text of Gen 2:9a (“And out of the ground the Lord God made to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food”) and Gen 1:12 (“The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed according to their own kinds, and trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its kind”) have several elements in common. It is striking that *Jub.* 2:7, which is a rewriting of Gen 1:12, has taken over some elements of Gen 2:9. In *Jub.* 2:7, as in Gen 2:9, it is God who made the trees grow out of the ground. In Gen 1:12 it is the earth which brings forth vegetation. Moreover, the words “for enjoyment and *for food*”⁵ in *Jub.*

³ See *Jub.* 3:8. For a discussion about the creation of Eve, see J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism. From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSS 1), Sheffield 1988, 90–91, 214–215, note 10. Cf. note 16 below.

⁴ J.C. VanderKam, “Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2”, *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994) 311–312.

⁵ The translation “for food” is defended by VanderKam. See J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 511; Scriptores Aethiopici, 88), Leuven 1989, 10.

2:7 have no equivalent in Gen 1:12. However, in Gen 2:9 the phrase “pleasant to the sight and good for food” is found.

In the third place, the transposition of the Garden of Eden to the context of Genesis 1 can also be brought about by the use of the expression *מקדם* in Gen 2:8. Usually, this expression in Gen 2:8 is translated as “in the east” (RSV: “And the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, in the east”). However, the meaning of *מקדם* is not only “east,” but also “in ancient time” or “aforetime.” Therefore, *מקדם* can also be translated as “earlier” and “before.”⁶ Based on this translation Gen 2:8 can be interpreted as follows: the creation of Eden took place *before* the creation of man.⁷

2.2. *Harmonising contradictions within the story of the Garden of Eden*

In addition to the harmonising contradictions between the two accounts of creation, the author of Jubilees also harmonises discrepancies within the story of the Garden itself. Here also we see the application of the strategies of omission and rearrangement.

First, I point to the *omission* of Gen 2:16–17, where the tree with the forbidden fruit and the sanction associated with eating are mentioned. The omission of these verses can be due, of course, to the fact that, according to Jubilees, man has not yet entered the Garden of Eden. Thus there is no reason to speak about trees and the forbidden fruit in the Garden. But there are also some problems within the text of Genesis itself. First, in the temptation scene the woman appears to know about the prohibition of the forbidden fruit (Gen 3:2–3). However, at the point of the story where the prohibition is given, it is given to man only. Moreover, the woman is not yet created, or, according to Jubilees, she has not yet been presented to man and has not yet entered the Garden. By omitting the prohibition in the creation story, the author partly solves this problem. But, even more importantly, there are some contradictory statements in the text of Genesis with regard to the *sanction* associated with the

⁶ Zie *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, III, 1000–1001; art. *קדם* (Kronholm), in: H.-J. Fabry – H. Ringgren (eds.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, VI, Stuttgart 1989, 1171–1175.

⁷ The creation of Eden on the third day of creation can also be found in *Gen* 1:5 and in 2 Enoch 30:1. Other texts put the creation of Eden even before the creation of the world (4 Ezra 3:6; the Palestinian Targums on Gen 2:8). In this opinion, *מקדם* is interpreted as “from the beginning.” See R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*, London 1902, 14–15; VanderKam, *Genesis 1*, 312, note 32.

fruit, i.e., the death of Adam. First, it is said that *on the day* that Adam would eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil he would die (Gen 2:17). Second, after he ate from the tree God said to Adam that the ground was cursed and that in sadness he shall eat of the ground *all the days of his life until he would return to the dust* (3:17–19). Finally, in Gen 5:5 it is said that Adam died at the age of 930 years, and there is no mention of any curse.

All three statements come together in the statement about the death of Adam in *Jub.* 4:29–30:

- 29a At the end of the nineteenth jubilee, during the seventh week—in its sixth year—Adam died.
- b All his children buried him in the land where he had been created.
- c He was the first to be buried in the earth.
- 30a He lacked 70 years from 1000 years because 1000 years are one day in the testimony of heaven.
- b For this reason it was written regarding the tree of knowledge:
- c “On the day that you eat from it
- d you will die.”
- e Therefore he did not complete the years of this day
- f because he died during it.

In this final statement about Adam, the author of Jubilees refers to Gen 5:5 by mentioning the year of his death, which is implicitly his age.⁸ Then the text describes that all the children of Adam buried him in the land, or in the earth, where he had been created. These words are an allusion to Gen 3:19: “Until you return to the *ground*, for out of it you were taken; you are *dust*, and to *dust* you shall

⁸ Except for one word (“he died”) the text of Gen 5:5 is changed completely. This is in line with the other entries in the genealogy of Jubilees 4. The rearrangement is caused by the fact that the mention of the death of Adam in 4:10, where the last time that Adam knew his wife is mentioned, would not have been the appropriate place in the sacred history. He died when he was 930 years old, and, in between, other things happened. The author prefers to put everything in its place. Cf. also, the death of Noah is delayed in the rewrite of Genesis (Gen 9:28–29; *Jub.* 10:15–17). The fact that he mentioned his death *after* the birth of Noah, which is in line with SamP (birth of Noah in 707), but not with MT (birth of Noah in 1056) or with LXX (birth of Noah in 1642), could be due to the fact that the birth of Noah and his name-giving (Gen 5:29c; *Jub.* 4:28e) are related to the curse of Adam (Gen 3:17–19; *Jub.* 3:25). In Gen 3:17 it is said that Adam shall eat in sadness *all the days of his life*. In the explanation of the name-giving of Noah it is said that he is the one who will give consolation from the sadness and from the earth that was cursed. If Adam had to suffer “all the days of his life,” he could not enjoy the consolation of Noah. Moreover, the phrase “all the days of his life” evoke the death of the person involved. The relevance of Gen 3:17–19 (*Jub.* 3:25) for 4:29–30 is strengthened in the following lines.

return". *Jub.* 3:25 replaces the word dust (עפר) with *medr*, which can mean either land (or earth), or ground. The phrase "in the land (= earth) where he had been created" reflects "the earth from which you were taken," whereas "to be buried in the earth" reflects "to the earth you shall return."⁹ The (natural) death of Adam is the execution of the sentence mentioned in Gen 3:19. It reveals a characteristic of the rewriting of the story of the Garden of Eden. The author of Jubilees removes the negative side of the Garden of Eden as much as possible.¹⁰ Finally, *Jub.* 4:30 tries to reconcile the contradiction between Gen 5:5, which says that Adam lived 930 years, and Gen 2:17, where God says to Adam that on the day that he eats from the tree he would surely die, by way of an allusion to Ps 90:4 ("Because a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday"). By referring to this text, the author of Jubilees is able to say that

⁹ Also according to *Apocalypse of Moses*, Adam's body was buried "in the place where God found the dust" (40:6). However, according to *Vitae Adae et Evae* 48:6, Adam was buried in parts of Paradise (48:6). According to Tg Ps-J Gen 2:7 and 2:15, the place where Adam was created was the place of the Temple ([2:7] "And he took dust from the site of the sanctuary"; [2:15] "Then God took Adam from the mountain of worship, the place where he had been created"). Tg Ps-J does not mention Adam's burial; however, according to Tg Ps-J Gen 3:23, Adam returns to "Mount Moriah from which he had been created." Also, according to rabbinic literature (e.g., *PT Nazir* 7, 56b; *Gen r* 14:8), the place where Adam was created was the place of the Temple. However, this is not the place of Adam's burial. The general opinion is that he was buried in the Cave of Machpelah, where not only Adam and Eve, but also Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their wives were thought to be buried (*BT Baba Bathra* 58a; *BT Erub* 53a). In *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* 20 it is stated that Adam built a mausoleum beyond Mount Moriah for himself. This would seem to indicate a place in the neighbourhood of the temple. However, it is further stated that "therefore it is called Cave of Machpelah." See A.F.J. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (NTS, 46), Leiden, 1977, 42–43.

¹⁰ He also mentions that Adam is the *first* to be buried. This is in line with Enosh (*Jub.* 4:12), who is the *first* to call on the name of the Lord, and Enoch (*Jub.* 4:17–18), who is the *first* of mankind to learn the arts of writing, instruction, and wisdom. He does not reflect upon the residence of the body of Abel. Ginzberg states that the author of Jubilees alludes to the legend of Apocalypse of Moses and related sources, according to which the burial of Abel was delayed. See L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, V, Philadelphia, 1955⁷, 125. Böttrich is more cautious: "*Jub.* 4,29 konstatierte noch schlicht, dass Adam als erster im Lande seiner Erschaffung begraben worden sei, ohne dabei über den Verbleib des zuvor erschlagenen Abels zu reflektieren." See Chr. Böttrich, "*Die Vögel des Himmels haben ihn begraben.*" *Überlieferungen zu Abels Bestattung und zur Ätiologie des Grabes* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, 3), Göttingen, 1995, 16. In later literature the delay of the burial of Abel until the death of Adam becomes an important theme. See, e.g., *Apocalypse of Moses* 40; *Vitae Adae et Evae* 48:1–2 ("And again the Lord said to the angels Michael and Uriel: 'Bring me three linen cloths and spread them out over Adam, and other cloths over his son Abel, and bury Adam and his son'). For the delay of the burial of Abel, see Böttrich, *Vögel*, 15–28.

Adam did die on the day that he ate the fruit.¹¹ He introduces the reference to Gen 2:17 with the words “it was written.” There are some modifications to the text of Gen 2:17. First, in the reference to the tree of knowledge, he omits the words “of good and evil.” Second, in the speech of God, he omits the first phrase (“you shall not eat”), which is important because it shows again that the author of Jubilees tries to remove the negative side of the Garden of Eden as much as possible. Third, he uses the plural forms of “you eat” and “you will die”, whereas MT uses the singular in both cases. By using the plural forms the prohibition and the sanction are also addressed to Adam’s wife.¹²

Jubilees 3:1–7, which describes the events of the second week of creation, reflects a second example of the harmonising strategy that is applied to the rewriting of Gen 2:18–24, which describes the creation of a helper. As you can see in the synoptic overview in the appendix, this passage of Jubilees includes several verbatim quotations. Nevertheless, there are also omissions, additions, and variations. The author omits the creation of the animals, and brings over the presentation of the animals to Adam and the name-giving.

I would like to refer especially to the rewriting of Gen 2:18 in *Jub.* 3:4. It is again an example of *rearrangement*. In Genesis this statement is made by God *before* the creation of the animals and their presentation; in Jubilees it is made *after* their presentation. In the

¹¹ The reference to Ps 90:4 is unmistakable, although the verbal agreements are few. First, there is a verbal quotation (“because a thousand years”). Secondly, “but as yesterday” is replaced by “one day”. This is also the case in 2 Peter 3:8 (“... with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day”) and rabbinic literature (cf. *Gen* 1 8:2; *Lev* 1 19:1; *Num* 1 5:4; 14:12; *Songs* 1 5:11,1). The comparative particle “as” is omitted. Nevertheless, many manuscripts (12 35^c 39 42 44 47 48 58) add *kama* (“as”). They are probably influenced by Ps 90:4. Finally, “in the testimony of heaven” probably replaces “in thy sight,” although it is also possible that with the words “in the testimony of heaven” the author indicates that he is referring to a biblical text. Also, in *Jub.* 23 the author of Jubilees is referring to Psalm 90. Cf. J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “Van tekst tot tekst. Psalm 90 en Jubileeen 23:12–15”, *NTT* 47 (1992) 177–185; J.C. Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse”, *DSD* 1 (1994) 322–337.

¹² MT, SamP, and Peshitta use the singular in both cases. The Septuagint, however, also reflects plural forms. Moreover, in MT Gen 3:1–3 (cf. *Jub.* 3:17–18) plural forms are also used with regard to the verbs “eating” and “dying.” Finally, the use of the absolute infinitive (“you will *surely* die”) in Gen 2:17 is not reflected in 4:30d. This seems to stress that, according to Jubilees, these words are not a punishment, but just the consequence of the action of eating.

text of Genesis it is God who observes that the man is alone, and He comes up with a plan. He creates the animals. However, He must admit that He has not created something that suits the man. Only then does He decide to build the woman. In Jubilees God's formation of the animals is not a mistaken attempt at finding a partner for Adam. The animals, which were just created in the first week are brought to Adam in the second week, and he gives them names. He observes the animals and sees that they are "male and female according to every kind," and he observes that he is alone,—that there is no one who is like himself, who will help him. It is the man himself who observes that he does not have anybody. Only after Adam discovers existential loneliness does God decide to make a helper.¹³

The modification of this part of the biblical story in Jubilees also shows that bringing the animals to Adam results in setting a new goal.¹⁴ Not only do they get their names, but they reveal to Adam, while he is observing them, that he is alone and that he is, in fact,

¹³ The quotation of Gen 2:18 in *Jub.* 3:4 shows some modifications. First, 3:4a includes one divine name, whereas Gen 3:18a includes two. Also, many mss of LXX and EthGen 2:18 include one divine name. Second, 3:4a has the addition "to us" (the angels). See also 3:1a: "we brought to Adam, on the Lord's orders". One of the angels speaks to Moses. According to Jubilees, the angels had already been created on the first day of creation (*Jub.* 2:2). It is possible that "to us" is added because in 3:1a they had already been present and active. They presented the animals to Adam. With the addition of "to us," the author of Jubilees probably stresses the presence of the angels. It is also possible that the addition has something to do with the third modification, i.e., 3:4c reads "let us make" instead of "let me make." The plural form does occur also in LXX Gen 2:18: ποιήσωμεν. Also Vg and EthGen 2:18 include a plural form, whereas MT, SamP, and Peshitta include the singular. The reading of LXX does remind one of LXX Gen 1:26 ("Let us make man": ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον). According to the Greek translator, the creation of the woman is at the same level as the creation of man. Cf. M. Harl, *La Genèse* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 1), Paris 1986, 105; M. Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223), Berlin & New York 1994, 68–69. The creation of man is formulated with a singular form in Jubilees (2:14: "He made"). The consequence of the addition of "to us" (3:4a) is that the plural form in 3:4c does not refer to God, but to God and the angels. It is possibly on account of a reaction against a textual tradition (attested in LXX, which includes a plural), that the author of Jubilees added "to us." It is possible that the *Vorlage* of Jubilees has the plural form ("Let us make"). The substantive "helper" (עֹזֵר) is rendered here with a substantive "helper" (*marde'a*), unlike 3:3e, where a verb "to help" (*rad'a*) is used to render the substantive. The Hebrew כַּנְטָר, ("as his counterpart," "suiting him") is rendered here with "like him" as in 3:3e.

¹⁴ For the following, compare G. Anderson, "Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden", *HTR* 82 (1989) 121–148 (esp. 128).

longing for a female. The addition and some of the modifications in 3:3 make clear that the bringing of the animals has a pedagogical function. It makes Adam aware of his incompleteness and his need for a partner.¹⁵ Adam's recognition of his need and the provision of this need¹⁶ leads to the sexual encounter of man and woman. The author emphasises their sexual encounter in his rewriting of Gen 2:22–24 with some additions and slight modifications in *Jub.* 3:6–7.

2.3. *Harmonising different traditions*

A third category of harmonising is not involved with harmonising contradictions between the first and the second accounts of creation, nor with contradictions within the story of the Garden of Eden itself, but with contradictions between the biblical story and traditions not documented in the bible—traditions that were authoritative for the author of Jubilees. One example of such a tradition is the *Book of Enoch*. In different places within the book of Jubilees, the author refers to several parts of 1 Enoch. See, for example, the material about Enoch himself in chapter 4.

In Jubilees 3 there might also be some influence of 1 Enoch, although it is less obvious than in chapter 4. First, I refer to the omission of the tree of life in Jubilees. In the story of Genesis, Adam is dismissed from the garden in order to prevent him from eating of the tree of life (Gen 3:22d–f, 24d). The omission of the reference to the tree of life might be because of the fact that it contradicts what God has said with regard to the sanction of eating from the tree of knowledge. However, the omission might also be because of the fact that when the *Book of Enoch* speaks about the Garden of Eden, it speaks about only one tree. It is the heavy smelling tree of wisdom from which Adam and his wife have eaten, and it will give life to the elect ones after the great judgement.¹⁷ Second, according to 1 Enoch, the origin of evil in the world is attributed to the fall of the angels, who are also called the Watchers. The Book of Jubilees modifies this tradition in that the Watchers originally come with pos-

¹⁵ Compare *Gen* 1 17:4: "Then he paraded them again before him in pairs. Adam said: Every one has a partner, yet I have none."

¹⁶ *Jub.* 3:5 (cf. *Gen* 2:21–22a) describes the completion of the woman, who was already created as one of the ribs of man. In *Gen* 3:8 this completion is interpreted as a presentation of the woman to Adam. Cf. note 3 above.

¹⁷ See 1 Enoch 24–25; 32.

itive intentions (*Jub.* 4:15), but once they are on earth the positive intentions disappear (*Jub.* 4:22; 5:1–11). Although the author of Jubilees does not attribute the origin of sin to the fall of Adam and his wife in the Garden, he seems to feel bound to the biblical text.¹⁸ Therefore, he cannot minimise the importance of the transgression in the Garden as much as in Enoch. However, one of the characteristics of the rewriting of Gen 2:4–3:24 in Jubilees is the fact that the author tries to minimise the negative side of Eden as much as possible. I point to the association of Eden with the Temple, to the portrayal of Adam as a priest, and to the softening of the expulsion scene.

2.4. *Eden as a Temple*

I now come to a last example of the differences between Genesis and Jubilees. I am not sure whether we can attribute this difference to the hermeneutic principle of harmonising or not. It is concerned mainly with the addition of 3:8–14.

The addition is connected with Gen 2:15, which was omitted in the beginning. This verse is quoted with some modifications in *Jub.* 3:9 (“we brought him into the Garden of Eden to work [it] and keep [it]),¹⁹ and it is another example of *rearrangement*. The author stresses that not only the man, but also the animals and the woman are created outside the garden. This is in line with the first creation narrative in Genesis 1. In this respect, it is another example of harmonising. However, the rearrangement *delays* the entrance of Adam and Eve into the Garden of Eden—a delay that is related to the *halakah* of the woman who is giving birth.

The hermeneutic background of this modification of the creation story of Genesis is, in my view, the conception of Eden as a sanctuary. The Garden of Eden is a holy place, more holy than any

¹⁸ Cf. VanderKam, *Enoch. A Man for All Generations* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament), Columbia, South Carolina 1995, 120.

¹⁹ First, the subject of the action is not the Lord God, but “we”, i.e., the angels. Also, in 3:1, 4a, and 15a the angels are the agents of the action. Second, the verb נָחַל (“to put”) of Gen 2:15b is not used, nor the word נָחַל (“to put”) of Gen 2:8b. Instead 3:9b uses the verb *bo’a* (“to enter”; causative: “to bring”). Cf. also Josephus, *Ant.* 1:38. This verb is also used in 3:9d, 12b and is influenced by the verb בָּוֵא in Lev 12:4c (= *Jub.* 3:10f, 13c). By the use of this verb in connection with the entrance, the author of Jubilees facilitates the connection of the entrance of Adam and Eve into the Garden of Eden and the entrance of the woman who is giving birth into the Temple.

land (3:12); it is a place that belongs to the Lord (4:26), and is conceived as “the Holy of Holies and the residence of the Lord” (8:19). It means that the Garden of Eden is seen as a Temple, or, more precisely as a part of the Temple: the room which is in the rear of the Temple, where the ark of the covenant of the Lord is placed, and which is often called “Holy of Holies.”²⁰ It is possible that the Garden of Eden is not seen as identical with the Temple, for sometimes Eden and the Temple are conceived as different entities. The author might see the relationship of the two as a sort of symbolic representation of one by the other.²¹ In any event, the author of Jubilees subscribes to the conception that Eden is related to the Temple, and this has important consequences for the rewriting of Genesis in the Book of Jubilees.

First, the author has difficulties with the view that the consummation of the sexual relationship of Adam and Eve took place inside the Garden.²² We know from the book of Exodus that before the descent and revelation of the Lord on Mount Sinai, the men of Israel should not go near to a woman for three days (Exod 19:15). And the book of Leviticus states that after having intercourse, the man is unclean until the evening, and he may not eat of the holy things unless he has bathed his body in water.²³ Some Qumran texts show a strict application of these laws: after having sex it is not permissible to enter the city of the Temple for three days.²⁴ This view

²⁰ Cf. Anderson, 129; J.M. Baumgarten, “Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees”, in: G.J. Brooke – F. García Martínez (eds.), *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (STDJ, 15), Leiden 1994, 3–10; B. Ego, “Heilige Zeit—heiliger Raum—heiliger Mensch. Beobachtungen zur Struktur der Gesetzesbegründung in der Schöpfungs- und Paradiesgeschichte des Jubiläenbuches”, in: M. Albani, J. Frey, A. Lange (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ, 65), Tübingen 1997, 207–219, 211–215; C.T.R. Hayward, “The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo’s Biblical Antiquities”, *JSS* 23 (1992) 1–20 (esp. 6–7); J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3:1–31”, *Bijdragen* 57 (1996) 305–317 (esp. 311–312).

²¹ See Ego, *Heilige Zeit*, 214.

²² See Anderson, *Celibacy*, 128–131.

²³ Cf. Lev 15:18; 22:4–7.

²⁴ 11QT^a 45:11–12 (“Anyone who lies with his wife and has an ejaculation, for three days shall not enter anywhere in the city of the temple in which I shall install my name . . .”); CD 11:21–12:2 (“... And everyone who enters the house of prostration should not enter with impurity requiring washing . . . No man should sleep with his wife in the city of the temple, defiling the city of the temple with their impurity”); 4Q274 (“If a man has an emission of semen, his touch transmits impurity”); cf. Baumgarten, *Purification*, 7; J. Milgrom, “4QTohora^a: an Unpublished

had a very important consequence for the rewriting of the biblical story of the Garden of Eden in the book of Jubilees, namely, that Adam and Eve are created not inside, but outside the Garden of Eden. This means that the first sexual relation between Adam and Eve does not take place in the garden of Eden, but *before* they enter. Only forty days after their first sexual relation is Adam permitted to enter the garden, and his wife must wait eighty days. The second sexual relation took place only in the second jubilee, a long time after they left the Garden of Eden (3:34). This means that laws concerning the Temple are applied to the Garden of Eden.

Second, in the Book of Jubilees the entrance of Adam and Eve into the Garden of Eden is explicitly related to the law concerning the woman who is giving birth, which is found in Leviticus 12. The mother observes seven days of impurity and thirty-three days of purification after the birth of a boy, and fourteen days of impurity and sixty-six days of purification after the birth of a girl. The reason for the disparity between the observation periods impurity and purification for the birth of a boy and the birth of a girl remains obscure. The author of Jubilees tries to give an explanation for this disparity by integrating Lev 12 into the story of the second week of creation. The author explains that the period of impurity following the delivery of a girl is double that of a boy because Eve was introduced to Adam in the second week of creation—seven days after he and the bone that became Eve had been created. Although the situation in Leviticus 12 does not completely fit the model of Jubilees, it is clear that the author tries to give an etiological reason for the disparity.²⁵ His radical changes to the text of Genesis 2–3 also reveal an exegetical effort to solve the problem of the lack of sufficient details in Leviticus 12.

Third, according to the author of Jubilees, Adam is acting as a prototype of a priest. He *burns incense* at the gate of the Garden of Eden (3:27: “On that day, as he was leaving the Garden of Eden, he burned incense as a pleasing fragrance—frankincense, galbanum, stacte, and aromatic spices—in the early morning when the sun rose at the time he covered his shame”). According to Exodus, the incense

Qumran Text on Purities”, in: D. Dimant – L.H. Schiffman (eds.), *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls* (STDJ 16), Leiden 1995, 59–68.

²⁵ See J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3), New York 1991, 750; Baumgarten, *Purification*, 5.

is burned in front of the Holy of Holies. The burning of incense is a privilege given to the priests, namely the sons of Aaron.²⁶

Related to the function of Adam as priest, is the covering of nakedness, which is a condition for offering. The priests are explicitly bidden to cover their nakedness.²⁷ The author of Jubilees lays emphasis on the covering of the nakedness. I point to 3:16, 21–22, 30–31. In 3:16, which is a modification of Gen 2:25, the statement refers to Adam alone (“*He* was naked *he* was ashamed”). The addition of “but he neither knew it” stresses the innocence of Adam with regard to his nakedness. It refers to his own nakedness, but probably also to the nakedness of his wife. In 3:21–22 this is illustrated quite clearly. In this text, which is a quotation of Gen 3:6–7 with some modifications, it is stated that after eating the fruit, the woman first covered her shame and then gave the fruit to Adam. Only after that were his eyes opened, and “he saw that he was naked.” The *halakah* concerning the covering of nakedness is even written in the heavenly tablets, as can be seen in 3:30–31. These last verses reveal that the emphasis on the covering of nakedness does not only result from the conception of Eden as a sanctuary. It also contains a protest against contemporary Hellenistic practices.²⁸

Also, the fact that Enoch, who is led from among the children of men, is brought by the angels into the Garden of Eden for his greatness and honour illustrates this view of Eden as the Temple. In the Garden he is not only “writing down the judgement and condemnation of the world”, but he is also burning incense, probably inside, maybe at the gate of the garden, or on the mountain of incense.²⁹

²⁶ See Exod 30:7–8, 34–38; Num 16:39–40; 2 Chron 26:16–20.

²⁷ See Exod 20:26; 28:42. According to the author of Jubilees, the meaning of Gen 3:21 (cf. *Jub.* 3:26) is that God has clothed the man in *priestly* clothing. The use of כְּתֹנִית עֹר, offers him the opportunity for this interpretation. Among the articles of clothing in which the priests are dressed are also the כְּתֹנִית. See Ego, *Heilige Zeit*, 215; S.N. Lambden, From Fig Leaves to Fingernails. Some Notes on the Garments of Adam and Eve in the Hebrew Bible and Select Early Postbiblical Jewish Writings, in: P. Morris – D. Sawyer, *A Walk in the Garden. Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden* (JSOTSS 136), Sheffield 1992, 74–90, esp. 82; Levison, *Portraits*, 93–95; Van Ruiten, *Garden*, 316.

²⁸ Cf. 1 Macc 1:13–14; 2 Macc 4:13–15.

²⁹ The Ethiopic reads *badabra qatr*: the mountain of the noon, or the mountain of the south. The word *qatr*, however, is probably a corrupted transcription of קְטֹרֶת (= “incense”). So E. Tisserant, “Fragments syriaques du Livre des Jubilés”, *RB* 30 (1921) 55–86, 206–232, esp. 77; J.C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16), Washington 1984, 187.

Whereas Adam burned incense in the morning, Enoch burns the incense of the evening of the sanctuary.³⁰ The motif of Enoch as a priest is not documented prior to Jubilees.³¹

It can be defended that the stress on the conception of the Garden of Eden as a Temple is in line with traditions both inside and outside the Bible. If this is true, this element of the author's rewrite should also be attributed to the harmonising tendency. However, although there is a tradition-historical relationship between the Garden of Eden and the Temple, prior to the Book of Jubilees, as far as the Old Testament is concerned it is difficult to establish that certain texts, which could have influenced the author of Jubilees, *explicitly* relate Eden to the Temple. What can be said is that the Old Testament speaks about Eden in two ways. First, it is referred to in conjunction with the loss of former glory (Gen 13:10; Ezek 28:11–19; 31:6–9, 16–18; Joel 2:3), and second, it is referred to in conjunction with a restoration in the future (Isa 51:3; Ezek 36:35). Only with regard to the second reference is Eden explicitly related to Zion.

As far as the early Jewish literature other than the Book of Jubilees is concerned, there are passages in which Eden is related to Jerusalem. In all these passages Eden is always associated with the *future* temple. I point to 1 Enoch 24–27; the Testament of Levi 18:6 and Testament of Dan 5:12; Apocalypse of Moses 29:1–6; and some Qumran texts where the expression *מקדש אדם* is used (4Q174; 4Q265; 4Q421).³² Although most of these texts are dated slightly later than the Book of Jubilees, it is possible, of course, that the author is referring to traditions within these texts.

Conclusions

I now come to some final conclusions. The rewriting of Genesis 2–3 in Jubilees 3 is characterised, in the first place, by the principle of

³⁰ The Syriac tradition reads “first” in stead of “sanctuary”. This is most probably a corruption. See VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 28, n.

³¹ It fits in with the tendency of Jubilees that makes all the important patriarchs in the line of Seth priests. Also Adam functions as a priest. Cf. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 186.

³² See J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees”, in: B. Ego, A. Lange, P. Pilhofer (eds.), *Community without Temple* (WUNT), Tübingen (forthcoming).

harmonisation. Many differences between Genesis and Jubilees can be attributed to this principle. The harmonisation in Jubilees 3 is concerned with conflicting statements between the two accounts of creation, conflicting statements within the story of the Garden of Eden itself, and conflicting statements between the biblical story and parallels and interpretations of the biblical story in early Jewish literature. In the second place, the rewriting is characterised by the fact that the Garden of Eden is conceived as a sanctuary. Many differences between Genesis and Jubilees can be reduced to this principle.

The author of Jubilees realises his hermeneutic principles in his rewriting of the biblical story by several exegetical strategies. In this paper I point to the omissions, additions, and other variations, and especially to the strategy of rearrangement. Also characteristic to Jubilees is the fact that the author inserts *halakot*, which are connected with the story-line. The *halakah* concerning the woman who is giving birth is related to the entrance in the Garden of Eden, and the *halakah* concerning the covering of nakedness is related to the departure from the Garden.

What was the ultimate purpose of the rewriting of Genesis in Jubilees? Did the author want to replace the book of Genesis by Jubilees in a canonical collection or did he want to relate the story of Genesis to a correct understanding of the Law, as a sort of *halakic midrash*? I have no clear answer to this question. We have to bear in mind that the boundaries of the canon were not yet fixed at the time Jubilees was written. Moreover, different groups within Judaism had different opinions about which books should be included in a canon of Holy Literature. The fact that the Book of Jubilees is attested quite well in the scrolls of Qumran suggests that at least one group within early Judaism was of the opinion that the Book of Jubilees should be included.

The method of rewriting Genesis in Jubilees has a parallel in the Bible. The books of Chronicles rewrites the story of Israel from the creation onwards, mainly focusing on the time of the kingdom. It can, therefore, be considered as a rewriting of the books of Kings. Both collections are presented in the canon of the Bible. The redactors received both written and oral traditions. They preserved at least part of them. But they also added their own interpretation of the older traditions. I refer to the way the primeval history is presented in the Bible. Both the older Yahwistic material and the priestly revi-

sion of it is recorded. It is puzzling, however, that the author of Jubilees cannot accept the diversity of the Yahwistic and priestly accounts of the primeval history. He tries to harmonise the accounts as much as possible by removing the contradictions and repetitions. It is, therefore, difficult to imagine that he would put his own account side by side with the biblical account(s) in a canonical collection of Holy Scriptures. Either it is meant to replace Genesis in a canonical collection—without contradictions and within a rigid chronological framework—or it is meant to be a form of Oral Torah *avant-la-date*. In the latter case it presents the correct interpretation of the *halakot*, adapting them to the changing situation of life.

PARADISE INTERPRETED

*Representations of Biblical Paradise
in Judaism and Christianity*

EDITED BY

GERARD P. LUTTIKHUIZEN



BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON • KÖLN
1999

THEMES IN BIBLICAL NARRATIVE

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN TRADITIONS

Editorial Board

PHILIP S. ALEXANDER – GERARD P. LUTTIKHUIZEN

Assistant Editor

FREEK VAN DER STEEN

Advisory Board

WOLFGANG A. BIENERT – JAMES L. KUGEL

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ – JAMES R. MUELLER – ED NOORT

VOLUME II

